

MAY 31 1966

STATINTL

Inside Report . . . By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak

Vendetta by Fulbright

WITH a surprise attack on the foreign aid bill, Sen. J. William Fulbright of Arkansas has served notice that his antagonism toward President Johnson's Vietnam position now extends to every aspect of Administration foreign policy—whatever its merits may be.

That does not exclude Fulbright repudiating his own carefully formulated positions of the past. For in leading his Senate Foreign Relations Committee last week in impromptu emasculation of the foreign aid bill, Chairman Fulbright was turning on his own creation—a program peppered with Fulbright proposals.

To an angry White House, this smacks of a vendetta by Fulbright. In fact, Fulbright and other foreign policy liberals are so possessed by outrage over Vietnam that they discard past principles in their blanket indictment of the Johnson foreign policy.

Ironically, foreign aid has been defended stoutly the last five years by Bill Fulbright. When Sen. Wayne Morse of Oregon took the floor in 1963 trying to cut the program to shreds, he was fought off by Fulbright.

BUT BY THE beginning of 1965, Fulbright made it clear to the Agency for International Development (AID) that he no longer would support the bill unless it was tailored to his specifications. AID complied with his requests.

That meant bilateral loans — administered by the World Bank instead of the U.S. Government — to underdeveloped nations. That also meant multi-year authorizations so that the Administration would not have to keep coming back annually to Fulbright's Committee. Incorporating so many of



Novak

Evans

Fulbright's proposals, the foreign aid bill was dubbed "the Fulbright bill" by jealous members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Fulbright dropped an ominous hint during his Committee's hearings on Vietnam by propounding his highly questionable doctrine that foreign aid is the precursor of military intervention. But AID officials were in no way prepared for last week's events.

Fulbright actually voted against his own five-year aid authorization scheme, and it was beaten, 11 to 6. That opened the doors for one amendment after another hamstringing the program with congressional restrictions.

Fulbright advocated amendments intended to limit development loans to no more than ten countries. When AID officials protested in closed-door session this would disrupt their plans for new programs to Cyprus, Nepal and Ceylon, they were answered by senatorial horse laughs.

IN THIS atmosphere, resistance was hopeless. Sen. Gale McGee of Wyoming, the Administration's chief spokesman on the Committee, was defeated 16 to 1 in resisting one damaging amendment. Ironically, the

Administration's most vocal defender inside the Committee during the foreign aid sessions was a member of the peace bloc: Sen. Joseph S. Clark of Pennsylvania.

While sharing Fulbright's opposition to Vietnam policy, Clark stops well short of vendetta. He does not feel Vietnam should lead liberals to adopt an isolationist stance all over the world. He argued during last week's sessions that the foreign aid program isn't big enough and that Americans should be mature enough to accept the foreign aid burden into the foreseeable future.

But Clark's was a voice in the wilderness. Every and any anti-foreign aid amendment was passed by the Committee with little chance of reversal on the Senate floor. The foreign aid bill had become part of Fulbright's obsessive onslaught on Vietnam policy.

BETWEEN FOREIGN aid sessions last week, Fulbright invited a psychiatrist and a psychologist to testify in open session against the Johnson foreign policy. Many Senators didn't realize that the psychologist—Professor Charles Osgood of the University of Illinois—is an ideologue on foreign policy matters who in 1962 wrote: "There is probably nothing more Communist about Castro Cuba than there is democratic about Franco Spain."

Osgood's appearance buttresses a feeling inside Senate cloakrooms that Fulbright is reaching out to find anybody who will testify against the President's foreign policy. His surprise onslaught on a foreign aid program he did so much to shape fits into that grand design.

© 1966, Publishers Newspaper Syndicate